

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-20 currently stand rejected. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 17, and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 7 and 17, respectively, as well as other limitations. Claims 7 and 17 have been amended to include new limitations. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11, 13-16, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2004/0139168 to Tanaka et al. (Tanaka) in further view of Anidi et al. (*Storage area networking – an introduction and future development trends*) (Anidi), and further in view of U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2003/0014523 to Teloh et al. (Teloh). Furthermore, claims 7-8 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, Tanaka, Anidi, and Teloh in view of U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2003/0115204 to Greenblatt et al. Therefore, since amended claim 1 now contains the limitations of claim 7 and amended claim 11 now contains the limitations of claim 17, the Applicant will discuss the patentability of claims 1 and 11 in view of AAPA, Tanaka, Anidi, Teloh, and Greenblatt under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1, as amended, sets forth a customer management system at the customer premises that is configured to receive instructions from a customer associated with the customer premises, and in response, to instruct second and third storage systems to increase data storage capacity for the customer premises and to instruct a bonded time division multiplex connection and a internet protocol connection to increase communications capacity for the customer premises. However, neither the AAPA, Tanaka, Anidi, Teloh, nor Greenblatt disclose a customer management system that, in response to instructions received from a customer associated with the customer premises, instructs second and third storage systems to increase data storage capacity for the customer premises and instructs a bonded time division multiplex connection and a internet protocol connection to increase communications capacity for the customer premises, as set forth in amended claim 1.

The present Office action admits that the AAPA, Tanaka, Anidi, and Teloh fail to

disclose a customer management system at the customer premises. (02-12-2009 Office Action, pg. 8, lines 9-11). Greenblatt is then provided as teaching this limitation. (02-12-2009 Office Action, pg. 8, lines 11-14). However, Greenblatt fails to teach a customer management system at a customer premises as set forth in claim 1. Instead, Greenblatt teaches that a management system is configured to, in part, receive a signal indicating occurrence of a monitored event and to identify rules having first conditions that are based upon the monitored event. (Greenblatt, para. [0015], lines 1-13). Furthermore, Greenblatt later identifies the management system as storage and data management server 104, which identifies rules based on the monitored event. (Greenblatt, para. [0022], lines 1-25; para. [0070], lines 1-9). However, Greenblatt also teaches that storage and data management server 104 is not a part of user (client) systems 102. (Greenblatt, para. [0022], lines 1-13; Fig. 1). Thus, Greenblatt fails to disclose a customer management system at the customer premises, as set forth in claim 1.

Regardless, for the sake of argument, even if Greenblatt did disclose a customer management system at a customer premises, Greenblatt still fails to disclose a customer management system that, in response to instructions received from a customer associated with the customer premises, instructs second and third storage systems to increase data storage capacity for the customer premises and instructs a bonded time division multiplex connection and a internet protocol connection to increase communications capacity for the customer premises, as set forth in amended claim 1. Greenblatt does disclose that storage and data management server 104 can detect when a storage capacity threshold has been reached. (Greenblatt, paras. [0044] and [0047]). However, Greenblatt fails to disclose that storage and data management server 104, in response to instructions received from a customer associated with the customer premises, instructs second and third storage systems to increase data storage capacity for the customer premises and instructs a bonded time division multiplex connection and a internet protocol connection to increase communications capacity for the customer premises. Thus, Greenblatt fails to disclose the customer management system set forth in claim 1.

Therefore, the AAPA, Tanaka, Anidi, Tanaka, and Greenblatt, separately and in combination, fail to disclose a customer management system that, in response to instructions received from a customer associated with the customer premises, instructs

second and third storage systems to increase data storage capacity for the customer premises and instructs a bonded time division multiplex connection and a internet protocol connection to increase communications capacity for the customer premises, as set forth in amended claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that amended claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record and respectfully requests such action at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent claim 11 recites limitations similar to those of claim 1 and, therefore, is respectfully considered allowable over the prior art of record for similar reasons as discussed above. Additionally, although additional reasons for allowance exist, in the interest of brevity and clarity, the Applicant refrains from discussion of dependent claims 3-6, 9-11, 13-16, and 19-20 in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable independent claims 1 or 11.

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, Tanaka, Anidi, and Teloh in view of U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0155984 to Padovano et al. Although additional reasons for allowance exist, in the interest of brevity and clarity, the Applicant refrains from a discussion of dependent claims 2 and 12 in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable independent claims 1 or 11.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-20 in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin D. Robb/

### **SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Kevin D. Robb, Reg. No. 47,901

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

### **Correspondence address:**

### **CUSTOMER NO. 28004**

Attn: Steven J. Funk

Sprint

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100